

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 97-1387

LAWRENCE WILDER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

DONNA E. SHALALA, SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. Frederic N. Smalkin, District Judge. (CA-
96-3472-S)

Submitted: June 19, 1997

Decided: June 27, 1997

Before WILKINS and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam
opinion.

Lawrence Wilder, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals the following district court orders: (1) letter order finding no ground to act upon Appellant's complaints against his former counsel; (2) order denying Appellant's motion for preliminary injunction; (3) marginal order denying Appellant's motion for appointment of counsel; (4) order denying Appellant's motion for the court to order his union to provide him with counsel; and (5) letter order returning documents unrelated to any pending motion.

This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, see 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (1994), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, see 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (1994); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949). To the extent that Appellant seeks review of the denial of his motion for preliminary injunction, this court has jurisdiction over that portion of the appeal. See 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1). We find that the district court did not err in denying the motion. Accordingly, we affirm the denial of the motion on the reasoning of the district court. Wilder v. Shalala, No. CA-96-3472-S (D. Md. Feb. 12, 1997).

To the extent that Appellant seeks review of the remaining orders, this court does not have jurisdiction because the orders are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. We therefore dismiss the appeal as to the denials of remaining motions.

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED IN PART, DISMISSED IN PART